

PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant:	Achim HANSEN	Examiner:	Justin V. Lewis
Serial No.:	10/589,178	Art Unit:	3725
Confirm. No.:	5881	Docket No.:	1093-161 PCT/US
Filing Date:	August 11, 2006	Dated:	October 21, 2009
Title:	OBJECT OF VALUE COMPRISING A MOIRE PATTERN		

Mail Stop Amendment
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

Certificate of EFS-Web Transmission

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office via the Office's electronic filing system on October 21, 2009.

Carla Bryan
(Printed Name)

/carla bryan/
(Signature)

SUMMARY OF OCTOBER 20, 2009 TELEPHONE INTERVIEW

Sir:

The Applicant hereby submits a summary of the telephone interview conducted with the Examiner Justin V. Lewis and Supervisory Patent Examiner Dana Ross on October 20, 2009 at 10:00 AM. First, the Applicant and the Applicant's attorney, Kevin E. McDermott, would like to thank the Examiner and Supervisory Examiner Ross for their time and their courtesy in agreeing to discuss the patent application with the Applicant's attorney.

During the interview the Applicant's attorney, Kevin E. McDermott, questioned the Examiner's findings in the October 6, 2009 Advisory Action in the above-captioned patent application. In particular, the Applicant's attorney questioned the finding that claims 16-30 were anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0027361 to Hardwick et al.

(“Hardwick”), which discloses a security document (i.e., a banknote) with a security device applied to the substrate.

After discussing the teachings of Hardwick, the Examiner asked if the Applicant’s claims were functionally distinguishable from the security devices disclosed in Hardwick. The Applicant’s attorney stated that the object of value in claim 16 had three moiré layers that included a moiré pattern and at least two moiré analyzers. The Applicant’s attorney stated that the functionality of the three moiré layers was described in the third paragraph of claim 16, which states:

two or more secondary layers which each contain a respective moiré analyzer for the moiré pattern of the first layer, and a first secondary layer is arranged on the same side of the carrier layer as the first layer and a second secondary layer is arranged on the opposite side of the carrier layer so that a first moiré image is visible when viewed in transmitted light and a second moiré image is visible when viewed in incident light,

The Examiner asked if the functionality of the moiré layers was disclosed in the specification. The Applicant’s attorney referred the Examiner to the bottom of page 6 of the Amendment filed by the Applicant on July 31, 2009, wherein the Applicant stated that: “The embodiment of the present invention found in claim 16 is described in the specification at page 13, line 18 to page 14, line 9.” On pages 6-8 of the July 31, 2009 Amendment, the Applicant reproduced the cited portion of the specification and Figs. 5a-c.

After reviewing the Applicant’s claims and the portions of the specification reproduced by the Applicant in the July 31, 2009 Office Action, the Examiner stated that the claims were distinguishable from the Hardwick reference and agreed to allow all of the claims. The

Examiner said a Notice of Allowance would be mailed within a few days.

The Applicant's attorney pointed out that the 6-month date for responding to the April 21, 2009 final Office Action was the day after the telephone interview (October 21, 2009) and asked the Examiner if he could send the Applicant a facsimile stating that a Notice of Allowance would be issued. Supervisory Examiner Ross said that this would not be necessary and that the Examiner would issue the Notice of Allowance following normal procedures. The Applicant's attorney asked if the Applicant needed to file anything and Supervisory Examiner Ross said that it was not necessary. The Applicant's attorney accepted the Supervisory Examiner's assurances.

No other issues were discussed during the telephone interview and no other agreements were reached.

Respectfully submitted,

/kevin e. mcdermott/
Kevin E. McDermott
Registration No.: 35,946
Attorney for Applicant

HOFFMANN & BARON, LLP
6900 Jericho Turnpike
Syosset, New York 11791
(516) 822-3550
323725_1